

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/521,158	01/13/2005	Ryo Minamida	2185-0743PUS1	8741
2292	7590 07/26/2006		EXAMINER	
	EWART KOLASCH &	OH, TAYLOR V		
PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1625	
			DATE MAILED: 07/26/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	,	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary		10/521,158	MINAMIDA ET AL.	
		Examiner	Art Unit	
•		Taylor Victor Oh	1625	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address	
A SH WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE as ions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. (D) (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
2a) <u></u> ☐	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 Ja This action is FINAL. 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		
Dispositi	on of Claims			
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□ 8)□ Applicati 9)□	Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or on Papers The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accertion and accertion and is/are: a) accertion and is/are: all	r election requirement.	Examiner.	
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ejected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) □ All b) □ Some * c) □ None of: 1. □ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. □ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. □ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.				
2) Notice	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date 1/13/05.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D: 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:		

Application/Control Number: 10/521,158

Art Unit: 1625

The Status of Claims

Claims 1-8 are pending.

Claims 1-8 are rejected.

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. It is noted that this application is a 371 of PCT/JP03/08555 filed on 07/04/2003, which has a foreign priority document ,Japan 2002-208056 filed on 07/17/2002.

Drawings

2. None.

Claim Objections

Claim 2 is objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 2, the chemical term "nitrocy" is recited. This expression is mis-spelled. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/521,158

Art Unit: 1625

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, the phrase "a substituted" is recited. This expression is vague and indefinite. In the absence of the specific moieties intended to effectuate modification by the "substitution" or attachment to the chemical core claimed, the term "substituted" renders the claims in which it appears indefinite in all occurrences wherein applicants fails to articulate by chemical name, structural formula or sufficiently distinct functional language, the particular moieties applicants regards as those which will facilitate substitution, requisite to identifying the composition of matter claimed. Therefore, an appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.

3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krief (US 4,408,066) in view of Anelli et al (J. Org. Chem. 1987, 52, p. 2559-2562).

Krief teaches a method for converting from 2,2-methyl-3-hydroxymethyl-cyclopropane-1-carboxylate to 2,2-methyl-3-formyl-cyclopropane-1-carboxylate in the presence of an oxidizing agent ,such as chromic anhydride and pyridine hydrochloride in methylene chloride(see col. 6 ,lines 60-66).

However, the instant invention differs from the prior art in that the use of claimed oxidizer hypochlorite and nitroxy compound, hydrogen carbonate are unspecified; the pH of the reaction is also unspecified.

Anelli et al teaches a process for oxidizing primary and secondary alcohols to the corresponding aldehdyes as shown in a summary (see page 2559, a lower section):

Primary alcohols are quantitatively exidized to aldehydes in a few minutes at 0 °C in CH₂Cl₂-0.35 M equeous NaOCl in the presence of catalytic amounts of 4-methoxy-2,2,6,6-tetramethylpiperidine-1-oxyl (3b). Cocatalysis by Br and buffering of pH at 8.6 with NaHCO₃ are also required. Secondary alcohols are converted to ketones. Further exidation of aldehydes to carboxylic acids is alow, but the reaction is completed in a few minutes under the same conditions by addition of catalytic amounts of phase-transfer catalyst. All reactions are highly selective. Only a slight excess of NaOCl is required. The method can be applied to saturated alkyl and aryl alkyl substrates.

Krief teaches expressly the method for changing from 2,2-methyl-3-hydroxymethyl-cyclopropane-1-carboxylate to 2,2-methyl-3-formyl-cyclopropane-1-carboxylate in the presence of the oxidizing agent in methylene chloride(see col. 6, lines

60-66). Similarly, Anelli et al does teach a generic process for oxidizing any primary alcohols to the corresponding aldehyde in the presence of hypochlorite and nitroxy compound. Both prior art have shared a common oxidation process for producing the aldehyde product from the alcohol by a similar reactant; for example, an oxidizing agent). Therefore, it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan in the art to be motivated to employ Anelli's et al hypochlorite and nitroxy compound as an alternative to chromic anhydride and pyridine hydrochloride oxidizer in order to enhance the selective oxidation of the primary alcohol to the corresponding desired aldehyde product. This is because the skilled artisan in the art would expect such a modification to be successful and efficient as shown in the prior art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Taylor Victor Oh whose telephone number is 571-272-0689. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas McKenzie can be reached on 571-272-0670. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1625

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Page 6